

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-13, 16, 17, 19-27, 29-34 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,923,552 to Brown ("Brown").

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, 13, 17, 25, 44, 45 and 46.

Applicants have canceled claim 7 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-13, 16, 17, 19-27, 29-34 and 44-46 are pending.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-13, 16, 17, 19-27, 29-34 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown. Applicants have canceled claim 7, rendering the rejection of claim 7 moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of the pending claims. Applicants have amended claim 1 to provide a different recitation relating to Applicants' invention. Claim 1 recites a work managing system wherein when there is a notification, at a work control site the notification includes at least one of a contrasting color on a display, flashing text on a display, sound emission, and vibration, such that the notification is forcibly made to the work executing site and the work executing site is made to notice the notification. Claims 13, 25 and 44-46 have been similarly amended.

As described at page 8, line 26 – page 9, line 5 of Applicants' specification, when a notification occurs, it is informed for example on the web page by a signal which makes the mode of expression of the text relating to the notification a mode of expression different from its surroundings. Due to this, notifications will no longer be overlooked and the instructions and monitoring of work information are reinforced. A mode of expression different from its surroundings means that the text is displayed by a color not used in the surroundings (red, green, yellow, etc.) or the text is made to flash (repeatedly turn on and off). Further, it is also possible to emit a sound or have the mobile phone speaker section or other unit vibrate. The point is that

when there is a notification, that notification is forcibly made to the work executing site and the work executing site is made to notice that notification.

At page 9, the Office Action relies on col. 7, lines 30-32 of Brown and the calendar described therein, for a signal of a mode of expression different than normal. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Brown does not disclose at least the features of “wherein when there is a notification, at a work control site the notification includes at least one of a contrasting color on a display, flashing text on a display, sound emission, and vibration, such that the notification is forcibly made to the work executing site and the work executing site is made to notice the notification,” as recited in claim 1.

Claims 4, 5 and 8-12 depend from claim 1, claims 16, 17 and 19-24 depend from claim 13, and claims 26, 27 and 29-34 depend from claim 25. The dependent claims recite the same combination of allowable features recited in the respective independent claims, as well as additional features that define over the prior art. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), of the pending claims, be withdrawn, and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Dated: October 21, 2008

By: 

Peter J. Sistare
Reg. No. 48,183

Customer No. 055694
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 842-8800
Fax: (202) 842-8465